

Minutes of: CALIFORNIA STATE ATHLETIC COMMISSION
Meeting Specifics: Regular Commission Meeting
December 12, 2002 – 9:00 a.m.
Embassy Suites- LAX South
1440 East Imperial Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

1. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRMAN

Commissioners Present: Van Gordon Sauter, Chairman
Sanford Michelman, Vice-Chairman
Armando Vergara
John Frierson
Martin Denkin

Commissioner Absent: Al Ducheny

Staff Present: Rob Lynch, Executive Officer
Earl Plowman, Deputy Attorney General
Anita Scuri, DCA Legal Counsel
Jessica Finch, Recording Secretary

(Due to time constraints the items were heard in the following order: (1-2-4-6-7-10-11-13-14-12-8-9-17.4-17.3.2-18)

2. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 17, 2002 COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Denkin objected to language used on page 4 paragraph 7. He stated that he was opposed to the statement that Chairman Sauter “declined” his suggestion. Chairman Sauter then suggested that the sentence be stricken from the minutes. Commissioner Denkin added that he also objected to language on page 5 paragraph 4. He stated that Mr. Claybon is a well qualified trainer and wished the record to reflect this. Mr. Lynch suggested that a sentence be added at the end of the paragraph to read ‘ Mr. Claybon is a well respected trainer’.

Action: Motion by Chairman Sauter and seconded by Vice-Chairman Michelman to approve minutes with above suggested changes.

Vote: Unanimous

3. SUMMARY OF CHAIRMAN ACTIVITIES SINCE LAST MEETING

Chairman Sauter stated that there was nothing to report.

4. SUMMARY OF EXECUTIVE OFFICER ACTIVITIES SINCE LAST MEETING

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that the Governor had called a special session of the Legislature to implement his 10 billion dollar statewide budget reduction. He explained that the Commission was facing the prospect of laying off an Office Technician, the Assistant Chief Athletic Inspector and .5 Staff Services Analyst to meet the proposed 20% reduction of \$130,000. Mr. Lynch stated that the Commission budget has previously been reduced by 24% and including the lay off of one occupied position. It now appears that the Commission's budget will only be reduced by \$1,000 for out of state travel for the Fiscal Year 02-03 and \$2,000 out of state travel for the Fiscal Year 03-04.

Mr. Lynch announced that two amateur toughman bouts had been held in California since the last Commission meeting. On November 29th and 30th Art Dore held his first promotion in San Bernardino and his second promotion was in Sacramento on December 6th and 7th. He explained that both promotions ran smoothly and what injuries they had were few and not serious. Mr. Lynch further explained that in San Bernardino the attendance was approximately 800 for both nights and the Sacramento attendance was approximately 1400.

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that Ron Williams dba R.W. Promotions has been suspended and fined \$2,500. Mr. Williams appeared at the October 17, 2002 Commission meeting for bouncing checks. The Commission voted to lower his fine to \$500 if within 30 days he paid the fine and submitted evidence that he had made good on all "bounced" checks. Mr. Williams did not comply with this Commission order. Chairman Sauter asked if staff had heard from Mr. Williams, to which Mr. Lynch replied that the staff had not. Vice-Chairman Michelman asked if Mr. Williams had any scheduled upcoming shows. Mr. Lynch replied that he did not.

Mr. Lynch then informed the Commission that staff recently suspended and fined Anthony Lewis dba Cant Lewz Promotions \$2,500 for issuing a non-sufficient funds check to the Commission in the amount of \$3, 616 for taxes, license fees, etc. from his October 24, 2002 promotion. He stated that Mr. Lewis has been given the opportunity to appeal the suspension and fine.

Mr. Lynch stated that Mr. Lohuis returned to work December 6, 2002 and Mr. Sal Barajas is scheduled to return January 2, 2003.

5. 2003 MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS

It was agreed by the Commission to meet on January 29, 2003 and then March 26, 2003 with all other dates to be determined.

6. PROFESSIONAL – AMATEUR FIGHT CARDS - ACTION

Mr. Lynch explained to the Commission that Commission Rule 242 states in part "...Clubs shall not schedule less than 26 round of boxing except with the approval of the Commission". Previous Commission policy was to permit promoters to have 18 rounds of professional boxing supplemented by 8 rounds of amateur boxing to meet the 26 round minimum. He further explained that one particular promoter is notorious for submitting an Advance Notice listing 26 rounds of professional boxing, however, when staff arrives at the weigh-in, there may be in

reality only 16-18 or 20 rounds of professional boxing and then the promoter pleads that staff permit him to supplement the card with amateur bouts. In order to be promoter friendly, staff generally accommodates the promoter.

Mr. Lynch stated that staff recommends that the Commission adopt the following policy:

If a promoter intends to promote a professional boxing event and advertises the event as professional boxing, that promoter shall be held accountable to Rule 242 requiring a minimum of 26 round plus a standby bout should one of the bouts fall out. No amateur bouts shall be permitted to make up the difference. If a promoter intends to promote a Pro/Am event his Advance Notice shall state this and he shall advertise the event as a Pro/Am card. In the case of a Pro/Am card, staff will then require a minimum of 18 rounds of professional boxing.

Commissioner Frierson stated that in previous years, amateur boxing would precede professional boxing bouts at the events in order to “warm up” the audience. Vice-Chairman Michelman asked if all promoters must submit advance notice of what type of boxing will be done at any said event, to which Mr. Lynch responded that the promoters are required to submit such an advance notice. Commissioner Denkin stated that he had a concern as to the advertising of Pro/Am cards and if 18 rounds would become the standard. Mr. Lynch replied that 26 rounds would remain the standard.

Mr. Plowman stated that the recommendation would require a change to the policy as well as a change to regulation. Mr. Plowman further reminded the Commission that this issue was an isolated issue with one particular promoter.

Chairman Sauter then asked Mr. Lynch if the Pro/Am cards were being done to promote local amateur boxing or to reduce cost to the promoter. Mr. Lynch stated that it was his belief that it was being done to reduce cost.

Vice-Chairman Michelman suggested that the current policy of 26 required rounds remain unchanged. He further suggested that an exception could be made for extenuating circumstances with those circumstance being submitted in writing to staff. Chairman Sauter agreed.

Ms. Scuri suggested that Rule 242 could be modified to add the sentence “All amateur bouts shall be in addition to the 26 rounds required by this section”.

Commissioner Frierson the asked if this was a frequent occurrence. Mr. Lynch stated that it was not. Chairman Sauter asked Commissioner Vergara his opinion, to which Commissioner Vergara stated that amateur boxing should be separate from the required rounds for professional boxing and that he supported keeping the current policy.

Chairman Sauter suggested that staff keep a record of the Pro/Am cards and submit a report back to the Commission in the future.

Action: Motion by Vice-Chairman Michelman and seconded by Commissioner Denkin to set Rule 242 modification for hearing.
Vote: Unanimous.

7. GLOVE WEIGHTS - INFORMATION

Mr. Lynch stated that the question was brought up in previous Commission meetings as to the following scenario:

Two boxers officially weigh in at 146 lbs. the day before a bout. At this weight they would be required to wear 8 oz. gloves. They are re-weighed on the day of the event to check for excessive weight gain and they both reweigh at 149 lbs. While this weight gain is not excessive, the boxers are now in a weight class that would require 10 oz. gloves. Should they now be required to wear 10 oz. gloves?

Mr. Lynch forwarded this question to the members of the Association of Boxing Commissions. Approximately 15 states responded and none of them have an additional weigh-in after the official weigh-in to check for excessive weight gain. All of the state commissions that responded with the exception of one, stated that the glove weight should be established at the official weigh-in and not at a later weigh-in. Mr. Lynch stated that he agreed.

Vice-Chairman Michelman asked if glove weight was a health and safety issue. Mr. Lynch stated that it was. Vice-Chairman Michelman then asked why did we not change the glove weight if such a situation should occur. Mr. Lynch stated that the Commissions that were polled agreed that the original official weigh-in weight should be the determining factor and not the weight at time of bout.

8. BOXERS' USE OF STEROIDS – REGULATIONS - INFORMATION

Mr. Lynch stated that with the recent positive steroid test performed on Fernando Vargas, the Commission may want to consider the testing for steroids for California licensed boxers. These tests could either be unilateral as a condition of licensure as a boxer or on a random basis.

He explained that currently California will administer a drug test (urine) if the bout is a title bout and the sanctioning body requires testing. Mr. Lynch added that steroid testing would probably be best suited for legislation rather than the regulatory process. Mr. Lynch also stated that one Assembly Committee had told Senator Perata that no steroid testing issues would get out of that Committee alive and this was for a bill in which the Commission would merely be approving performance enhancing testing policies for professional sports franchises.

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that currently staff requests that licensed gymnasiums post a notice regarding the sale, use or exchange of anabolic steroids, testosterone and human growth hormone stating that California law provides that it is illegal to aid or abet in the unlawful sale, use or exchange of anabolic steroids, testosterone, and human growth hormone.

Chairman Sauter then asked if steroid use was a problem in the boxing community. Mr. Lynch stated that it was his belief that steroid use is not a problem within the boxing industry. Dr. Wallace agreed.

Vice-Chairman Michelman asked if Mr. Vargas was currently licensed by California, to which Mr. Lynch stated he was not.

Dr. Wallace stated that steroid use would diminish the dexterity and hand speed in boxing.

Mr. Lynch asked Mr. Hendrick, representing the Ultimate Fighting Challenge, if steroid use was a problem for mixed martial arts, Mr. Hendrick replied that it was not a major concern at this time.

Ms. Scuri reminded the Commission that there is a Business and Professions Code Section 18710 that in part that allows the Commission at its discretion to “require a special medical exam....” when there is cause to believe there is steroid or other drug use and an examination is necessary.

Action: No action was taken.

Vote: No vote was taken.

9. ASSIGNMENT OF PHYSICIANS AND NUMBER OF PHYSICIANS ASSIGNED

TO EVENTS - ACTION

Mr. Lynch stated that it has been Commission policy for some time that two doctors shall be assigned to all events and if the event is televised three doctors shall be assigned. He explained that there have been times when only one doctor has been assigned to an event due to circumstances beyond anyone’s control.

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that Dr. Wallace provides a list of suggested doctors to staff a month in advance for assignment to events. Staff contacts the doctors regarding the assignments and makes substitutions as needed.

Mr. Lynch stated that it was his recommendation that these procedures be kept intact.

Dr. Wallace stated that it was his belief that if there is a situation where only one doctor is assigned to an event, that a ‘senior’ physician be assigned. It is Dr. Wallace’s opinion that the ‘junior’ physicians are unqualified and inexperienced and are not acceptable.

Mr. Lynch stated that current regulation requires that new physicians attend six events to gain some training on being a ringside physician. Dr. Wallace stated that this was insufficient.

Dr. Wallace stated that it is his belief that the current ringside physicians will turn down assignments made by staff, but not if they were assigned by his office. Mr. Lynch did not agree.

Chairman Sauter suggested that staff keep Dr. Wallace apprised of the ‘turn-down’ rate among physicians.

Action: No action was taken.

Vote: No vote was taken.

10. REFEREE EVALUATION AND ASSIGNMENTS PROGRAM – INFORMATION

/ ACTION

Commissioner Denkin stated that at the last meeting the Commission was in agreement that accountability was necessary, but the current system was not sufficient. He added that he submitted his suggestions to the Commission for their review regarding “classification” of officials and suggestions to change the evaluation. Commissioner Denkin suggested that a poll be taken among the current officials to rate the top 6 officials who would then be assigned to the top bouts. He further explained that although the officials are currently rotated on assignments, the quality of the bouts and pay of the bouts differ immensely. Commissioner Denkin stated that although all officials may work approximately 12-15 bouts a year, the income levels may differ by thousands of dollars.

Commissioner Frierson stated that he currently receives a copy of all evaluations. He explained that at the events that he has attended and taken notes as to the officials abilities he has seen a vast difference at times between himself and the evaluator. He further explained that this is not to say the evaluator was incorrect, but that the evaluator may have seen something that Commissioner Frierson did not. Commissioner Frierson added that perhaps a solution would be to have more evaluators on staff.

Chairman Sauter then asked Commissioner Denkin that if it was his opinion that Mr. Lohuis used favoritism in assignments of officials. Mr. Denkin stated that indeed that was his belief. Chairman Sauter then asked if Commissioner Denkin felt that Mr. Larry Rozadilla, evaluator, also used favoritism in his evaluations. Commissioner Denkin stated he believed that Mr. Lohuis and Mr. Rozadilla agreed that certain officials are less effective whether that is the case or not.

Commissioner Frierson stated he did not agree with that statement, but he did feel that the evaluation process needed to be re-evaluated.

Vice-Chairman Michelman stated that it was his understanding that the goal of this discussion was to take the current subjective evaluation process and assignment of officials and make it objective. Vice-Chairman Michelman added that this may not be possible in this particular situation, and that some subjectivity needed to remain. He explained that this was not because any one person was being biased or acting inappropriately – he believed that the ‘nature of the beast’ is subjective.

Commissioner Denkin stated that it was also his concern that judges are ranked regarding their percentages in judging and he did not believe this was fair. Chairman Sauter informed

Commissioner Denkin that it would be impossible not to have a system that is somewhat subjective. He further stated that he does not agree with the exact process and that it was his sentiment that the evaluation form be reviewed by a committee and brought back to the Commission for approval. Chairman Sauter added that it was his belief that continuing education would be superior to evaluations in the long run.

Chairman Sauter then asked Commissioner Denkin if he felt the current system was not equitable and fair. Commissioner Denkin stated that he and other officials do feel that way and he personally supports education and training for officials that are not performing well. Commissioner Denkin stated that the current evaluation form is in dire need of review.

Mr. Jerry Roth, attorney, stated that certain officials have been requested by sanctioning bodies to work particular events, although many times these requests are declined by staff of the Commission. He further stated that it was his belief that if the official disagrees with their evaluation the official does not have any recourse.

Chairman Sauter informed the Commission that it was his sentiment that the officials need to believe that the evaluation process is equitable and was open to suggestions from the Commission to attain that goal.

Mr. Plowman stated accommodating sanctioning bodies with every request for a particular official is a set up for a potential lawsuit. Chairman Sauter replied that potential litigation was not the current issue, but the evaluation process. Mr. Plowman reminded the Commission that Rule 376 and Rule 377 mandates that the officials be evaluated, but perhaps the problem is the number of evaluators that are available. He stated that other than videotaping from a 3 dimensional angle, there is no way to be able to see everything.

Mr. Lynch suggested that the Officials Committee review the evaluation form. Vice-Chairman Michelman stated that it need not be the Officials Committee, but a committee none the less, to review the form and submit changes to the Commission.

Commissioner Frierson also stated that additional evaluators needed to be added to ensure fairness to all officials.

Commissioner Denkin stated that it was his belief that the mechanics of officials was no longer be evaluated but the style in which they officiate. He stated that this was not the intention of the evaluation at the conception.

Vice-Chairman Michelman stated again that a committee consisting of officials, Commission members and staff to discuss and make recommendations to the Commission.

Chairman Sauter asked if the current evaluation form was in need of revamping to which Commissioner Frierson stated that he agreed that it did.

Vice-Chairman Michelman suggested that this committee also review perimeters for ranking the officials. Mr. Plowman stated that this could not be accomplished without a change to the

regulation. He did agree that evaluation form needed to be reviewed and changed with adding perhaps that the mechanics that are being evaluated be spelled out on the back of the form so that there is a clear understanding as to the nature of the evaluation. He further stated that style should not be part of the evaluation and was under the impression that style was not being evaluated, only mechanics.

Chairman Sauter asked Mr. Lynch his opinion on this. Mr. Lynch stated that the Officials Committee ask other officials to join them in a discussion of the evaluation form.

Commissioner Frierson stated he was concerned as to the intimidation the officials might feel in such a discussion.

Chairman Sauter stated that a committee needed to be created to review the evaluation form and process. He further added that this committee would be comprised of several officials, legal staff, and Commission staff. Chairman Sauter suggested that he and Mr. Lynch develop such a Committee. Mr. Lynch agreed.

Action: No action was taken.

Vote: No vote was taken.

11. CAGE FIGHTING – MIXED MARTIAL ARTS – INFORMATION / ACTION

Mr. Lynch stated that at the last Commission meeting, the question was asked as to how the Commission handles mixed martial arts events. He stated that these events are technically illegal and we have had no cooperation from the local authorities when we have requested their assistance. Staff currently treats these events as wrestling exhibitions because the results of the bouts are prearranged. He added that the promoters furnish staff with a list with who is going to beat whom in the matches. Mr. Lynch concluded with stating that an inspector is sent to each venue to collect the appropriate taxes. He then asked the Commission as to direction on how to handle such events in the future.

Vice-Chairman Michelman asked to whether or not the Commission has the authority to fine these individuals for conducting illegal events. Mr. Plowman stated the Commission does not have any non-licensee cite and fine authority. Mr. Plowman explained that unlike boxing, the Commission does not currently have statues for prosecuting mixed martial arts.

Commissioner Denkin asked as to the progress of Ms. Scuri with combining the regulations of kickboxing and mixed martial arts. He also stated that Mr. Lynch informed him that these events were prearranged, but it was his understanding that the participants were unaware of the predetermination.

Chairman Sauter asked to the reason the Attorney General did not attain an injunction regarding these events. Mr. Plowman stated that the Commission does not have independent injunction authority. He further explained that he would have to have the permission of the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs to pursue this avenue.

Vice-Chairman Michelman asked what it would take to change the legislation in this matter, to which Ms. Scuri stated that the Commission would need to obtain an author for such legislation. Mr. Plowman stated that in light of the current “bum fights” attention, Penal Code changes needed to be done.

Commissioner Denkin then asked Dr. Nelson Hamilton if indeed these events were prearranged. Dr. Hamilton stated that he personally had spoken to two promoters, seven contestants, and one trainer and all of these persons stated that they were unaware of these events being prearranged. He explained that ‘double scorecards’ or something of that nature may be occurring, but to clarify – no one he had spoken to agreed with the statement that these events are prearranged or that the contestants know who is going to win. It was Dr. Hamilton’s opinion that the promoters that are having these events are not a representation of the mixed martial arts community and are not considered to be having legitimate events.

Mr. Bud Brutsman, producer of King of the Cage, stated that he currently conducts regular events on Indian reservations and outside of the State of California. He explained to the Commission that he agreed that the events were not predetermined and that these particular club promoters were not representative of promoters such as himself that have spent millions of dollars to promote mixed martial arts. He further explained that they are currently working with other states to regulate mixed martial arts. Mr. Brutsman stated that he and his promotion are willing to work with the Commission regarding regulating and promoting mixed martial arts. He concluded that calling these events ‘wrestling’ to him was offensive.

Mr. Kirk Hendrick, general counsel for Ultimate Fighting Challenge, stated that the UFC is very interested in coming to California as a true and legitimate sport. He agreed with Mr. Brutsman as to the negativity of these ‘underground’ events. He went on to inform the Commission that at the last event held in Las Vegas, Nevada held at the MGM Grand, there were approximately 14,000 in attendance and did approximately \$1.5 million in gate revenue. He further added that approximately 60% of those in attendance at that show were from California. Mr. Hendrick was also in agreement that California needed to regulate mixed martial arts and his promotion was also willing to work with the Commission to attain that goal.

Chairman Sauter then asked if either gentleman had any friendships in the legislature in which to help pass legislation. Mr. Hendrick and Mr. Brutsman stated that they not at this time but would be willing to pursue that avenue.

Chairman Sauter asked if the last event UFC held was issued on pay-per-view. Mr. Hendrick stated that it was. Chairman Sauter then asked how many units were sold, to which Mr. Hendrick stated that he did not know the hard numbers, but it was estimated at 120,000 at \$29.95 per unit. Mr. Hendrick stated that both the gate (1.5 million) and the pay-per-view (3.5 million) were both taxable.

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that staff had worked two years on regulations for mixed martial arts and the Commission, the mixed martial arts industry, and Department of Consumer Affairs were all in agreement to regulate mixed martial arts, but the Administration denied the regulations. He added that the Commission was never given a reason for the denial.

Mr. Plowman reminded the Commission that all of the other states that regulate mixed martial arts use the regulations that we developed.

Chairman Sauter then asked who was doing these local promotions in the Los Angeles area to which Mr. Brutsman stated that the promoters were 'club' promoters and not legitimate professional promotions.

Ms. Scuri informed the Commission that due to the State's current financial situation, someone needs to persuade the Administration 1) That the Commission would be providing an essential service and 2) That it would be revenue producing.

Chairman Sauter then asked for both Mr. Brutsman and Mr. Hendrick's cooperation in trying to meet our goal to regulate mixed martial arts. Mr. Brutsman stated that they both agreed to do what they can, including the legislative approach.

Commissioner Denkin asked if the promoters were selling alcohol at these events, and suggested they contact Alcohol Beverage Control to cooperate with the Commission to shut the events down. Chairman Sauter stated that that may be an avenue to pursue.

Chairman Sauter then instructed Mr. Lynch to send out "cease and desist" letters to any promoter, with a copy going to the local district attorney, desiring to promote mixed martial arts. He also instructed Mr. Lynch to meet with members of the mixed martial arts community and legal staff as to the direction the Commission may want to go.

12. MARTIAL ARTS REGULATIONS – INFORMATION / ACTION

Dr. Hamilton stated that he had received the draft regulations from Ms. Scuri and will review the regulations and reply to her as soon as possible.

Commissioner Frierson asked if there were any problems with judges or referees for the events. Dr. Hamilton stated that occasionally officials who primarily work boxing events work these events, but it is not a 'problem'. He also added that should mixed martial arts be regulated, he has two well qualified people who are interested in being an official.

Chairman Sauter then asked Dr. Hamilton how California ranked as far as officiating kickboxing events in comparison to other states. Dr. Hamilton stated that California does a good job, considering the regulations that California is working with.

13. REQUEST FOR LUMP SUM DISTRIBUTION OF PENSION BENEFITS – MEDICAL DISABILITY - ACTION

Mr. Lynch stated that Michael Anderson is requesting a lump sum distribution of his pension benefits pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 18887 and Rule 406 (d)(3) for disability retirement. Mr. Anderson has been under the care of the VA Hospital in Leavenworth,

Kansas. The report provided by the VA Hospital states that Mr. Anderson suffers from glaucoma; cataracts; constricted visual fields; vitreous membrane formation caused by a hemorrhage – all in the right eye. It was also found that Mr. Anderson has a loss of central fixation as well. The cataract condition was originally detected in 1984, with the remainder of the problems found at his 1998 exam. It was the physician’s recommendation that boxing not be continued.

Mr. Lynch continued that Mr. Anderson is now 47 years old. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 18887, the Commission may award a lump sum disbursement to a professional boxer in lieu of a pension. Mr. Anderson is entitled to approximately \$12,078 in an early retirement benefit.

Mr. Lynch concluded with stating that staff recommends that Mr. Anderson be granted his lump sum distribution due to his medical disability. If approved, the request for distribution would be processed immediately.

Action: Motion by Vice-Chairman Michelman and seconded by Commissioner Vergara to approve lump sum distribution to Mr. Anderson in lieu of a pension.

Vote: Unanimous.

14. BAD CHECK POLICY – INFORMATION / ACTION

Commissioner Denkin suggested that any promoter who issues a check that is not honored be fined immediately and required to appear before the Commission before any further events can be held. He suggested that this occur on the first occasion. Vice-Chairman Michelman stated that the current policy giving the Commission leeway seems to be the most appropriate system. Vice-Chairman Michelman stated that other promoters should not have to pay a penalty for a few that do not comply.

Chairman Sauter stated that keeping the discretion of the Commission is imperative at this point. He stated that when an occasion arises that the Commission acts quickly and decisively regarding this issue. Commissioner Denkin disagreed. Commissioner Denkin stated his concern was for the person to which the check “bounces”.

Commissioner Frierson stated that he agreed with Chairman Sauter to keep the current policy. He stated that there are circumstances that arise that the Commission needs to have some discretion as to how to handle the individual situation.

Commissioner Frierson pointed out that the bounced check issue was primarily with two promoters who are currently under suspension. He reiterated that he did not want to condemn a new promoter for past promoter problems.

Chairman Sauter suggested that staff monitor the checks that are coming in and report back to the Commission at the next meeting.

15. BUDGET REVIEW – INFORMATION

This item was heard under Item 4.

16. STRATEGIC PLAN – INFORMATION / ACTION

This item was not heard.

17. COMMITTEE REPORTS – INFORMATION / ACTION

17.1 Arbitration Committee Report

This item was not heard.

17.2 Pension Plan Review Committee Report

This item was not heard.

17.3 Medical and Safety Standards Advisory Committee Report

17.3.1 Association of Boxing Commissions Medical Input

This item was not heard.

17.3.2 Injury Update

Dr. Wallace stated that he had attended both toughman events promoted by Art Dore and it is his opinion that it was handled professionally and the likelihood of injury is minimal. He stated that his only concern is that the referee should double check the ropes at the beginning of each bout due to the fact that there may be 600 lbs. in the ring at one time.

Dr. Wallace also stated that there is concern as to doing the physicals and neurological exams the day of the event. He stated that there was an occasion that a boxer stated to a doctor that he been driving all night and had not been training for the event. He explained that the boxer was subsequently knocked out in that bout. It was the ringside physician's concern that he "had" to approve the boxer to fight due to the fact that this bout was replacing the main event that had fallen out. Mr. Lynch asked Dr. Wallace how much time before the event did the promoter schedule this particular fighter. Dr. Wallace stated that it was the day before the event. Dr. Wallace stated that it was his belief that this boxer should not have fought, but the ringside physician felt compelled to allow him to participate.

Dr. Wallace asked the Commission regarding the following scenario:

If a fighter who has been knocked out in another state and been suspended by that state for a period less than what is required by California, by which standard does California allow him to fight?

Mr. Plowman and Ms. Scuri concurred that if a physician found it medically inadvisable to allow a fighter to participate, that physician could exclude that participant from the event.

Chairman Sauter stated that he believed that we should abide by our standards rather than other states standards keeping the health and safety of the fighter in mind.

Mr. Plowman suggested that Mr. Lynch poll other members of the ABC regarding this issue.

Chairman Sauter asked that this issue be discussed at the next meeting.

Dr. Wallace then asked the length of time that blood is valid for licensure. Ms. Scuri explained to him that the blood work must be done within 30 days from the date of the application for licensure..

Commissioner Denkin asked for the requirements for screening a potential professional boxer. Ms. Scuri replied that they must meet all requirements of licensure before screening.

17.4 Officials Committee Report

17.4.1 Policies

Commissioner Denkin stated that he had a concern as to the protection worn by a boxer which is not to exceed the height of the contestants belly button, but often this requirement is overlooked.

Commissioner Denkin also stated concern regarding state title fights and their requirements.

He also stated that representation by the Commission should be made at all major press conferences.

Commissioner Denkin stated that he also had concern regarding a show in Del Mar in which officials may have been paid twice. Chairman Sauter instructed Mr. Lynch to address this issue.

17.5 Amateur Boxing Committee Report

This item was not heard.

17.6 Martial Arts Advisory Committee

This item was not heard.

18. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Report by committee to review and make recommendations regarding the officials evaluation form and process.
- Bad Check Status.
- Length of Suspensions in other states vs. California
- Physician and Referee communication when an injury seems to be “fake”
- Competitive bouts

19. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS

There were no comments at this time.

20. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Dr. Nelson Hamilton introduced Mr. Josh Gross of FightSport Magazine and maxfighting.com who is highly interested in mixed martial arts in California.

The meeting was then adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

The draft minutes were prepared by:	_____	12/23/02
	JESSICA FINCH	DATE

The final minutes were prepared by:	_____	1/29/03
	JESSICA FINCH	DATE